



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/835,873	04/16/2001	Mark Vange	CIRC018	5575

25235 7590 05/08/2003

HOGAN & HARTSON LLP
ONE TABOR CENTER, SUITE 1500
1200 SEVENTEENTH ST
DENVER, CO 80202

EXAMINER

ALAUBAIDI, HAYTHIM J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 05/08/2003

h

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/835,873

Applicant(s)

VANGE ET AL.

Examiner

Haythim J. Alaubaidi

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 April 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 17-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 21-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - A. Claims 1-16 and 21-23 are drawn to a method for database querying and converting formats, classified in class 707, subclass 3 and 523.
 - B. Claims 17-20 are drawn to a method for prioritizing a database access, classified in class 707, subclass 9.

Inventions A - B are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention **A** has separate utility such as the database querying and converting data formats; invention **B** has separate utility such as the prioritizing a database access. Each of the two inventions does not require the particulars of the remaining inventions.

During a telephone Voice Mail with Mr. Stuart T. Langley on May 02, 2003 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute invention A, Claims 1-16 and 21-23. Affirmation of this election must be made by the Applicant in replying to this office action. Claims 17-20 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1. 142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

DETAILED ACTION

2. Claims 1-16 and 21-23, are presented for examination.

Priority

3. This application is a continuation of provisional Application No. 60/197,490 and therefore, accorded the benefit of the earlier filing date of 17 April, 2000.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 5 and 6, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The term "topologically close" in the above-mentioned Claims are a relative term, which renders the claim indefinite. The term "topologically close" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably appraised of the scope of the invention. Examiner is unclear as to how close "topologically close" means. Examiner is unable to determine what the Claims entail because the term is not clearly defined in the specification (i.e. Page 10, Lines 14-33).

Examiner asserts that all claims should be checked for clarification. Appropriate action is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-4, 8-9 and 15-16, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shoichi Nagatomo (U.S. Patent No. 6,334,126 and Nagatomo hereinafter).

Regarding Claims 1, 8, and 15-16, Nagatomo discloses:

providing a communication network (Figure No 1, Element No. 3)

generating requests for database content (Figure No. 2A, Element No. S1)

providing an intermediary server coupled to the network (Figure No. 1, Element No. 2)

providing a data storage mechanism coupled to the network (Figure No. 1, Element No. 1) and having an interface for communicating with the intermediary server (Col 7, Lines 60-65)

causing the intermediary server to access the data storage mechanism (Col 5, Lines 61-63, i.e. The server 2 analyzes a search request sent over a network 3 by a search requester 8, and accesses the database 1 to acquire a search result)

using the intermediary server to format database content obtained from the data storage mechanism to a format usable by the client application (Col 6, Lines 3-8, i.e. *This "conversion" is to convert a search result (data) to another attribute (e.g., from text data to voice data), or to convert data of a predetermined format to data of another format (e.g., from image data of the GIF (Graphics Interchange Format) to image of the JPEG (Joint Photographic Experts Group); see also Col 6, Lines 39-442, i.e. The server 2 converts the search result to another data format or edits the search result, as needed, in accordance with the ability or functions of a communication terminal at the destination*)

delivering the formatted content to the client application that generated the request (Col 6, Lines 54-58, i.e. *In accordance with this request, the server 2 converts the search result obtained from the database 1 to another data format or edits the search result, and then sends out the search result to the associated one of the communication terminals 4-7 over the network 3*).

Regarding Claims 2 and 9, Nagatomo discloses wherein at least one of the (DBMS) client and the intermediary servers comprise listener processes configured to accept requests (Col 8, Lines 24-26, i.e. *For example, the PC 4 may make a search request to the server 2, and the server 2 may send out the search result to the PDA 5 or the pager terminal 7*).

Regarding Claim 3, Nagatomo discloses wherein at least one of the client applications comprises a web browser application and the request comprises a HTTP request (Col 1, Lines 22-26; see also Col 12, Lines 3-11; see also Col 18, Lines 49-51).

Regarding Claim 4, Nagatomo discloses wherein the intermediary server comprises a web server (Col 18, Lines 27-34, i.e. *In the system of this embodiment, upon issuance of a search request from a PC (Personal Computer or the like) 4, PDA (Personal Digital Assistant) 5, a telephone (including a mobile phone) 6 or the like, a server 40 acquires information from a Web server (not illustrated).*

8. Claims 21-23, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Randy Burdick (U.S. Patent No. 6,148,307 and Burdick hereinafter).

Regarding Claim 21, Burdick discloses:
generating requests for database content using a plurality of client applications (Col 6, Lines 50-59)
providing an intermediary server coupled to receive the request (Col 6, Lines 38-39)
providing a data storage mechanism coupled to the network (Figure No. 1, Element No. 106)
causing the intermediary server to determine availability of the data storage (Col 9, Lines 16-20)
using the intermediary server to obtain substitute database content in response to determining that the data storage mechanism is busy/unavailable (Col 6, Lines 22-37); and delivering the request (Col 7, Lines 40-41, i.e. *the client may be notified when the search request has been complete*)

Regarding Claim 22, the limitations of this claim is similar in scope to the rejected claim 21, above. In addition Burdick discloses causing an intermediary server to respond to at least some received requests using the local data storage rather than by accessing the database management system (Col 6, Lines 60-63).

Regarding Claim 23, Burdick discloses redirecting a request for database content to an intermediary servers (Col 6, Lines 60-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 5-7 and 10-14, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoichi Nagatomo (U.S. Patent No. 6,334,126 and Nagatomo hereinafter), and further in view of Steven Colby (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,647 and Colby hereinafter).

Regarding Claims 5-6 and 10, Nagatomo reference discloses all of the claimed subject matter set forth above, except it does not explicitly indicate the step of wherein the intermediary server is topologically located close to the client applications and topologically distant from the data storage mechanism. However Colby teaches

Art Unit: 2171

wherein the intermediary server is topologically located close to the client applications and topologically distant from the data storage mechanism (Abstract, i.e. A content-aware flow switch intercepts a client content request in an IP network, and transparently directs the content request to a best-fit server. The best-fit server is chosen based on the type of content requested, the quality of service requirements implied by the content request, the degree of load on available servers, network congestion information, and the proximity of the client to available servers; see also Col 22, Lines 40-43, i.e. client-server proximity information descriptive of distances between the client and at least one of the candidate servers). Given the intended broad application of the Nagatomo system, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Nagatomo with the teachings of Colby for a number of reasons, such as to increase the network performance by minimizing the overall network traffic and/or reducing the server response time or delay.

Regarding Claims 7 and 11, Colby discloses the support for prioritizing the requests (Col 2, Lines 17-19, i.e. *Such techniques prioritize network requests*).

Regarding Claim 12, Colby discloses priority of request based on the user of the client (Col 22, Lines 60-63).

Regarding Claims 13 and 14, Colby discloses specifying the priority by the database (Col 11, Lines 27-37).

Other Prior Art Made of Record

11. a. Nishizawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,598) discloses an active memory and memory control method, and heterogeneous data integration use system using the memory and method;

b. Krishnan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,502,175) discloses a method and apparatus for locating caches in a network to optimize performance; and

c. Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 6,125,304) discloses coordinate data converting method and device thereof.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

Points of Contact

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haythim J. Alaubaidi whose telephone number is (703) 305-1950. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached on (703) 308-1436.

Application/Control Number: 09/835,873
Art Unit: 2171

Page 10

Any response to this office action should be mailed to:

The Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 or telefax at
our fax number (703) 746-7238 or (703) 746-7239 or (703) 746-7240.

Hand-delivered response should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, 6th
Floor Receptionist, Arlington, Virginia. 22202.

Haythim J. Alaubaidi

Haythim J. Alaubaidi
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100
May 2, 2003


SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100